arXiv:1406.4849v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 21 Oct 2014

Universal Finite-Size Corrections of the Entanglement Entropy of Quantum Ladders and the Entropic Area Law

J. C. Xavier[1] and F. B. Ramos[1]

[1] *Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Instituto de Física, Caixa Postal 593, 38400-902 Uberlândia, MG, Brazil*

(Dated: October 22, 2014)

We investigate the finite-size corrections of the entanglement entropy of critical ladders and propose a conjecture for its scaling behavior. The conjecture is verified for free fermions, Heisenberg and quantum Ising ladders. Our results support that the prefactor of the logarithmic correction of the entanglement entropy of critical ladder models is universal and it is associated with the central charge of the one-dimensional version of the models and with the number of branches associated with gapless excitations. Our results suggest that it is possible to infer whether there is a violation of the entropic area law in two-dimensional critical systems by analyzing the scaling behavior of the entanglement entropy of ladder systems, which are easier to deal.

PACS numbers: 05.30.-d, 03.67.Mn, 64.60.an

Introduction. Entanglement is a very peculiar property of composite systems which has intrigued the physicists since the beginning of quantum mechanics. The entanglement is a fundamental ingredient to teleport quantum states and it is also an important key in quantum computation and quantum information [1]. Among the various quantifiers of entanglement, the entanglement entropy (EE) is one of the most used since it is sensitive to the long-distance quantum correlations of critical systems.

In the last years, physicists working in distinct areas (such as quantum information, quantum field theory and condensed matter) have made a great effort to understand the scaling behavior of the EE of bipartite systems. In particular, the violation of the entropic area law has been a highly debated issue in recent years [2–16]. The EE of two composite subsystems $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is defined as the von Neumann entropy $S_{\mathcal{A}} = -\mathrm{Tr}\rho_{\mathcal{A}} \ln \rho_{\mathcal{A}}$, associated to the reduced density matrix $\rho_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}}\rho$. Since $S_{\mathcal{A}} = S_{\mathcal{B}}$, the information is shared only among the degrees of freedom localized around the surface ("area") separating both systems, due to this fact it is expected that the EE of cube $\mathcal{A}$ with side $\mathcal{N}$ behaves as $S_{\mathcal{A}} \sim \mathcal{N}^{d-1}$, where d is the dimension and $\mathcal{N}^{d-1}$ is the boundary "area" separating the regions $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Indeed, this scaling behavior is expected for gapped systems [17] and was also observed for some critical systems (see Ref. 13 and references therein). On the other hand, some models such as the one-dimensional critical systems [18], the free fermions systems with a finite Fermi surface in any dimension [7, 8], the two-dimensional (2D) Heisenberg model [19, 20] and the 2D conformal critical systems [21, 22] present beyond the $\mathcal{N}^{d-1}$ correction a logarithmic term.

It is well known that the prefactor of the logarithmic correction of critical one-dimensional systems of size L is universal and it is associated with the central charge c by the following equation [18]



Figure 1: (Color online) Illustration of six-leg ladders divided into two entangled blocks. In (a) the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$ is immersed in the middle of the system while in (b) the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$ is in corner of the ladder. We also present the labels of the sites.

$$S(L,\ell) = \frac{c}{3\eta} \ln \left[\frac{\eta L}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi \ell}{L}\right) \right] + a, \qquad (1)$$

where ℓ is the size of the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$, a is a non-universal constant and $\eta = 1(2)$ for the systems under periodic (open/fixed) boundary conditions. Note that other subleading corrections exist and are related with the scaling dimensions [23].

For any dimension d, it is expected the following general behavior for the EE of a cube $\mathcal{A}$ with side $\mathcal{N}$ (see Fig. 1)

$$S(\ell) = A\mathcal{N}^{d-1} + C(\mathcal{N}) \ln(\mathcal{N}) + B. \qquad (2)$$

In this work, we determine numerically $C(\mathcal{N})$ for some *quantum ladders* and found that it is universal. The N-leg ladders are characterized by N parallel chains of size L coupled one to each others [24]. We denote the size of the ladders by $N \times L$. The N-leg ladders are easier to deal than the two-dimensional systems and can be used as a simple route to study the EE of the two-dimensional systems. Here, we consider ladders composed of the following critical chains: free fermions chains, Heisenberg chains and the quantum Ising chains.

Although most of the works done in the literature consider the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$ immersed in a "reservoir", as illustrated in the Fig. 1(a), for ladder systems is convenient to consider the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$ in the corner of the ladders [see Fig. 1(b)]. Our main aim is to present a conjecture to the scaling behavior of the EE of critical ladders. Surprisingly, we verify that the finite-size corrections of the EE of quantum ladders are very similar to those of critical chains [Eq. (1)]. Consider a ladder system composed of N quantum chains of size L, and let ℓ be the number of sites of the block $\mathcal{A}$ labeled as Fig. 1(b). We propose that the scaling behavior of the EE of critical ladders is given by

$$S(\ell) = AN + \frac{c}{3\eta_x} N_{gl} \ln\left[\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi\ell}{NL}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right)}\right] + B$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{[\frac{N}{2}]} a_j \cos\left(2\pi\ell j/N\right) , \qquad (3)$$

where c is the central charge (of the quantum chain used to build the ladders), N_{gl} is the number of dispersion branches associated with the gapless excitations for a given energy, η_x=1 (2) for ladders under periodic (open/fixed) boundary in the x direction and A, B and a_j are non-universal constants. The last term in the above equation is an ansatz that we use which has been shown to be efficient for describing the oscillations of the EE. The importance of the number of gapless modes in the the EE have been discussed in spin systems [25] and boson systems. [26] The above conjecture indicates that the prefactor of the logarithmic correction of the EE of *critical ladders* is universal and it is related with the universality class of critical behavior of the chains that are used to build the quantum ladders. Note that for gapped systems $N_{gl} = 0$ and the Eq. (3) suggests us that the entropic area law holds in this case, as expected. Below, we present results for critical ladders that support our conjecture.

Free Fermions Ladders. Let us first consider a free-fermions ladders whose Hamiltonian is given by

$$H = \sum_{k_x,k_y} \mathcal{E}(k_x,k_y) c^{\dagger}_{k_x,k_y} c_{k_x,k_y} , \qquad (4)$$

where the dispersion is $\mathcal{E}(k_x,k_y) = -2\left[\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)\right]$ and sum is taken for all wave numbers in the Brillouin zone. The momenta are given by $k_x = j_x \frac{2\pi}{L}$ [$j_x \frac{\pi}{L+1}$] and $k_y = j_y \frac{2\pi}{N}$ [$j_y \frac{\pi}{N+1}$] for periodic [open] boundary condition in x and y directions, respectively. The variables j_x and j_y are integers and its values depend on the boundary conditions.

In the case of free fermions systems it is possible to determine the EE for very large systems by using the correlation matrix method [27]. Note that in principle it is possible to use the Widom conjecture [6, 28] to determine



Figure 2: (Color online) The band dispersions of the four-leg free fermions ladders for different boundary conditions. The horizontal dashed lines indicate the positions of the Fermi levels for three values of densities ρ. We also indicate the values of N_{gl} associated with each density. Note that some branches are degenerate.

the prefactor that appears in the logarithmic correction (see for example Ref. 12). However, we observe that this prefactor is easier to understand in terms of the number of gapless modes N_{gl} that cross the Fermi level. For the sake of clarification, we display in Fig. 2 the band dispersions for the four-leg ladder as well as the values of N_{gl} for some densities ρ. For the half-filling case with periodic boundary condition (PBC) in the x direction and open boundary condition (OBC) in y direction, the number of gapless modes that cross the Fermi level is equal to the number of legs, i. e., $N_{gl} = N$ (for the other boundary conditions $N_{gl} \approx N$ for large values of N). So, based in our conjecture we expect that the EE for large values of N and L behaves as $S(\ell = NL/2) = AN + \frac{1}{6}N\ln(\frac{L}{\pi}) + B$, which suggest that the entropic area law is broken for the half-filling case. Indeed, this was observed in free fermions systems in two dimensions [5–7, 11, 29].

In Fig 3(a), we present $S(\ell)$ as function of ℓ for a cluster of size 4×750 with PBC [OBC] in the x [y] direction and three values of densities. As we observe, the data obtained by the correlation matrix method agree perfectly with the conjecture proposed [Eq. (3)]. In the fitting procedure, we used $c = 1$ (which corresponds to the central charge of the one-dimensional chain) and the values of N_{gl} used were obtained counting the number of gapless modes that cross the Fermi level, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Similar agreements are found for several other ladders, as shown in Fig. 3(b).

In order to understand the contribution of the first term of Eq. (3), we present in Fig. 3(c) the EE for the 20×60 and the 40×120 clusters with PBC [OBC] in the x [y] direction at half-filling. As we can note, $S(\ell)$ grows lineary for $\ell \leq N$ and the logarithmic scaling is



Figure 3: (Color online) $S(\ell)$ vs. ℓ for the free fermions ladders. (a) Results for a cluster 4×750 and three values of ρ. Inset: $S(\ell)$ for few sites. In order to show all data in the figure we added some constants in the values of S. (b) Data of the EE for several ladders at half-filling. From these fits we get $A = 0.56$, $B = 0.37$. The non-universal constants a_j are small and varying from -0.04 to -0.01. (c) Results for the twenty- and forty-leg ladders at half-filling. In (a) and (b) the symbols are the data obtained by the correlation matrix method (see text) and the solid lines connect the fitted points by using our conjecture [Eq. 3].



Figure 4: (Color online) (a) $S(\ell)$ for the Heisenberg ladders with spins $s = 1/2$ and $s = 3/2$. The symbols are the data obtained by DMRG and the solid lines connect the fitted points by using our conjecture [Eq. 3] with $c = 1$ and $N_{gl} = 1$. From these fits we get $A = 0.27$ and $B = 0.16$ for $s = 1/2$. Inset shows $S(\ell)$ for few sites. (b) $S(\ell = NL/2) - AN - B$ vs. $-1/6 \ln\left[\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right)\right]$ for several cluster sizes with $s = 1/2$.

present only for $\ell \geq N$ [see inset of Fig. 3(c)]. If we impose an ansatz for $S(\ell)$ similar to the Eq. (1) and use the fact that $S(\ell)$ is continuous at $\ell = N$ (i. e., $AN + B = \frac{c}{3\eta_x} N_{gl} \ln\left[\frac{NL}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right)\right] + a$) we realize that the EE must behave as Eq. (3). This is very interesting, since in principle we can obtain the prefactor A by studying the behavior of $S(\ell)$ for $\ell < N$, which is easier to obtain.

Heisenberg Ladders. Now, let us consider the N-leg spin-s Heisenberg ladders whose hamiltonian is given by

$$H = J \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} \mathbf{S}_{i,j} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i,j+1} + J \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{L} \mathbf{S}_{i,j} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i+1,j} \, ,$$

where $\mathbf{S}_{i,j}$ is the spin-s operator at the i-th leg and j-th rung. We have set $J = 1$ to fix the energy scale. It is well known that the N-leg spin-s Heisenberg ladders is gapless (gapped) if sN is semi-integer (integer) [24, 30], see also the Ref. 31 and references therein. Here, we focus in the case of critical ladders, i. e. sN is semi-integer. For the Heisenberg ladders case, we obtained numerically the EE by using the density-matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [32]. For simplicity we consider only OBC in both directions. The spin-s Heisenberg chains with semi-integer spins have central charge $c = 1$ [33]. Besides, based in the spin wave approximation it is expected that the dispersion of the 2D Heisenberg model has one Goldstone mode $E(k) \sim \sqrt{k_x^2 + k_y^2}$. Since the number of legs N is finite, the values of k_y are discrete. Due to this fact, in analogous to the free fermions case, there is just one dispersion branch ($E(k_x, 0) \sim |k_x|$) associated with gapless excitations that crosses the energy of the ground state, i.e. $N_{gl} = 1$. In Fig. 4(a), we display the $S(\ell)$ as function of ℓ for the Heisenberg ladders with spins $s = 1/2$ and $s = 3/2$. Similar to the free fermions case, the Eq. (3) reproduces quite well the scaling behavior of $S(\ell)$ if we use $c = 1$ and $N_{gl} = 1$. Note that in this



Figure 5: (Color online) (a) Finite-size estimates of the critical point, $\lambda_c(N,L)$, as function of $1/L$ for the two- and three-leg Ising ladders. Inset: λ_c^N vs. $1/N$. (b) $S(\ell)$ vs. ℓ for three values of N at the critical points. The symbols are the DMRG results and the solid lines connect the fitted points by using our conjecture [Eq. 3] with $c = 1/2$ and $N_{gl} = 1$. In order to show all data in the figure we added some constants in the values of S. Inset shows $S(\ell)$ for few sites.

case, our results suggest that a violation of the entropic area law is not expected in the two-dimensional systems. The EE for large values of N and L should behave as $S(\ell = NL/2) = AN + \frac{1}{6}\ln(\frac{L}{\pi}) + B$. In order to verify this, we present in Fig. 4(b) $S(\ell = NL/2) - AN - B$ as function of $-1/6\ln\left[\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right)\right]$. As we see, the data strongly indicate that the prefator of the logarithmic term is $1/6$ for the Heisenberg ladders when the subsystem is in the conner. Note that this result is intriguing, at least for the point of view of N uncoupled chains under OBC, which could suggest that the prefactor is $N/6$. Note that Monte Carlo simulations [19] as well as the DMRG results [20] show a similar behavior for the scaling of the EE for other aspect ratio.

Quantum Ising Ladders. Finally, let us consider the N-leg quantum Ising ladders whose hamiltonian is given by

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{L-1}\sigma_{i,j}^{x}\sigma_{i,j+1}^{x} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{j=1}^{L}\sigma_{i,j}^{x}\sigma_{i+1,j}^{x} + \lambda\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{L}\sigma_{i,j}^{z},$$

where $\sigma_{i,j}^{x,y,z}$ are Pauli matrices at the i-th leg and j-th rung. The one-dimensional case, i. e. $N = 1$, has a critical point at $\lambda_c = 1$ and its critical behavior is described by a conformal field theory with central charge $c = 1/2$. In order to test the validity of Eq. (3) for the Ising ladders, we have first to determine the critical values of λ_c^N for each value of N. First, we get the finite-size estimates of $\lambda_c(N,L)$ using the EE as reported in Ref. 34. Then, we assume that $\lambda_c(N,L)$ behaves as $\lambda_c(N,L) = \lambda_c(N) + a/L + b/L^2$, and finally we fit the data to obtain $\lambda_c(N)$. As illustration, we present in Fig. 5(a) $\lambda_c(N,L)$ as function of $1/L$ for the two and three-leg Ising ladders. By fitting our data we obtained $\lambda_c(N) = 1.838$, 2.219, 2.443, 2.578, and 2.670 for $N = 2, 3, 4, 5$ and 6, respectively. It is interesting to note that if we extrapolate these estimates to obtain $\lambda_c(\infty)$, as report in the inset of Fig. 5(a), we obtain $\lambda_c^{2D} = \lambda_c(\infty) = 3.1$, which is close to the estimates of the critical point of the two-dimensional quantum Ising model obtained by Monte Carlo [35] ($\lambda_c^{2D} = 3.044$) and by the multiscale entanglement renormalization ansatz [36] ($\lambda_c^{2D} = 3.07$). The small discrepancy between our estimate and the last ones is very probable associated with the small lattice sizes considered to extrapolate our data.

As in the Heisenberg model, it is expected that $N_{gl} = 1$ for the critical Ising ladders, and we do not anticipate a violation of the entropic area law for the two-dimensional quantum Ising model. The EE should behaves, at the critical point, as $S(\ell = NL/2) = AN + \frac{1}{12}\ln(\frac{L}{\pi}) + B$, for OBC in both directions. In Fig. 5(b), we present the EE of the Ising ladders at the critical points acquired by DMRG for $N = 2, 3$ and $N = 4$. As we can note in this figure, the conjecture proposed [Eq. (3)] also reproduces quite well the scaling behavior of the EE of the critical Ising ladders.

Conclusions. We present an ansatz [Eq. (3)] for the finite-size corrections of the entanglement entropy of critical ladders. We verify that the ansatz is able to reproduce quite well the scaling behavior of the entanglement entropy of some critical ladders, namely: free fermions ladders, Heisenberg ladders and Ising ladders. Preliminary results of the quantum $q = 3$ Potts ladders (not shown) also corroborate with the scaling behavior of the entanglement entropy proposed. All those results support that the prefactor of the logarithmic correction of the critical ladders is universal and it is related with central charge of the one-dimensional version of the model as well as the number of branches associated with gapless excitations. Note that Eq. 3 is valid for $L >> N$ and only when the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$ is consider in the corner of the ladder. A puzzle still unsolved, is find the exact value of the prefactor of the logarithmic term, when the subsystem $\mathcal{A}$ is immersed in the middle of the ladders.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank B. Bauer to point out the Ref. 26. This research was supported by the Brazilian agencies FAPEMIG and CNPq.

[1] R. Horodeck, P. Horodeck, M. Horodeck, and K. Horodeck, Rev. Mod. Phys **81**, 865 (2009).
[2] A. Amico, R. Fazio, Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).
[3] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 666 (1993).
[4] M. B. Plenio, J. Eisert, J. Dreißig, and M. Cramer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 060503 (2005).
[5] M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010404 (2006).
[6] D. Gioev and I. Klich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 100503 (2006).
[7] W. Li, L. Ding, R. Yu, T. Roscilde, and S. Haas, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 073103 (2006).
[8] T. Barthel, M.-C. Chung, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 022329 (2006).
[9] B. Swingle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050502 (2010).
[10] S. Farkas and Z. Zimborás, J. Math. Phys. **48**, 102110 (2007).
[11] H. Leschke, A. V. Sobolev, and W. Spitzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 160403 (2014).
[12] P. Calabrese, M. Mintchev, and E. Vicari, EPL **97**, 20009 (2012).
[13] J. Eisert, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 277 (2010).
[14] L. Ding, N. Bray-Ali, R. Yu, and S. Haas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 215701 (2008).
[15] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).
[16] A. B. Kallin, I. González, M. B. Hastings, and R. G. Melko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 117203 (2009).
[17] M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, M. B. Hastings, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 070502 (2008).
[18] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. , P06002 (2004).
[19] A. B. Kallin, M. B. Hastings, R. G. Melko, and R. R. P. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 165134 (2011).
[20] H. F. Song, N. Laflorencie, S. Rachel, and K. L. Hur, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 224410 (2011).
[21] E. Fradkin and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050404 (2006).
[22] J-M.Stéphan, S. Furukawa, G. Misguich, and V. Pasquier, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 184421 (2009).
[23] P. Calabrese, M. Campostrini, F. Essler, and B. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 095701 (2010); J. C. Xavier and F. C. Alcaraz, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 024418 (2012).
[24] E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, Science **271**, 618 (1996).
[25] F. Fagotti, *Eur. Phys. Lett.* **97**, 17002 (2012); D. Eloy and J. C. Xavier, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 064421 (2012); B. Bauer, B. P. Keller, M. Dolfi, S. Trebest, and A. W. W. Ludwing, *arXiv:1303.6963* (2013).
[26] R. V. Mishmash, M. S. Block, R. K. Kaul, D. N. Sheng, O. I. Motrunich, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 245127 (2011).
[27] I. Peschel, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **36**, L205 (2003).
[28] H. Widom, *Toeplitz centennial (Tel Aviv, 1981)Operator Theory: Advances Appications*, Vol. 4 (Birkhuse, Basel-Boston, MA, 1981).
[29] Huan-Qiang Zhou, T. Barthel, J. O. Fjærestad, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 050305(R) (2006).
[30] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Lett. **93A**, 464 (1983); D. Sénéchal, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 15319 (1995); G. Sierra, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **29**, 3299 (1996).
[31] F. B. Ramos and J. C. Xavier, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 094424 (2014).
[32] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992).
[33] I. Affleck, D. Gepner, H. J. Schulz, and T. Ziman, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **22**, 511 (1989); F. C. Alcaraz and A. Moreo, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 2896 (1992); J. C. Xavier, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 224404 (2010); K. Hallberg, X. Q. G. Wang, P. Horsch, and A. Moreo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4955 (1996); M. Fuehringer, S. Rachel, R. Thomale, M. Greiter, and P. Schmitteckert, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **17**, 922 (2008).
[34] J. C. Xavier and F. C. Alcaraz, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 094410 (2011).
[35] H. W. J. Blöte and Y. Deng, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 066110 (2002).
[36] G. Evenbly and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 180406 (2009).